

012.P59016

Remarks

Claims 1-20 were presented for examination. Claims 1-11 and 14-20 were rejected. Claims 12 and 13 were objected to. The Examiner indicated claims 5, 14, 15, 19 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner also indicated that claims 12 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 3-5, and claims 3-8 have been canceled. Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 12, and claim 12 has been canceled. Claim 15 has been amended. Claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 19, and claim 19 has been canceled. Claim 20 has been amended. Furthermore, various informal amendments to the specification have been made. No new matter has been added.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure and required correction of a minor typographical error. The Abstract has been amended herein to correct the error.

The Examiner further objected to various minor errors in the specification. The specification has been amended herein to correct these errors, with one exception. The terms "parallel bitwise" and "bitwise parallel" are believed to be interchangeable. Indeed, a quick Internet search reveals both terms being utilized by various artisans. The Examiner is therefore kindly invited to explain why such terms would not be synonymous and further why one should be changed to the other or vice-versa, or to otherwise withdraw the objection.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to various informalities in claims 6, 9, 10, 16 and 17. The claims have been amended herein where appropriate to correct such informalities, however, for the reasons as discussed above with respect to the specification, no changes to claims 10 or 17 have been made with respect to the recitation "parallel bitwise." It is therefore believed the claim objections have been overcome.

012.P59016

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 14, 15, 19 and 20 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The claims have been amended and/or canceled where appropriate to correct the informalities specified by the Examiner. It is believed the rejections has been overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-11 and 16-18 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated the patent to Kim (6,442,729). Claim 1 has been amended herein as described above to incorporate limitations of allowable dependent claims, and claims 6-7 have been canceled. Claims 9 and 16 have been likewise amended as described above to incorporate limitations of allowable dependent claims. It is therefore believed the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Kim. Claim 8 has been canceled herein. It should be noted that the assertions made in support of the rejection, including the Official Notice, are moot in view of the cancellation of claim 8, however the Assignee reserves the right to address such issues without prejudice if the subject matter of claim 8 is presented in a continuing application.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner indicated claims 5, 14, 15, 19 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections 35 USC 112, second paragraph. The Examiner also indicated that claims 12 and 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As discussed, above, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 3-5, and claims 3-8 have been canceled. Claim 9 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 12, and claim 12 has been canceled. Claim 15 has been amended. Claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 19, and claim 19 has been canceled. Claim 20 has been amended. Furthermore, various informal amendments to the specification have been made. No new matter has been added. It is therefore believed that all claims are presently in a condition for allowance.

012.P59016

It is noted that claimed subject matter may be patentably distinguished from the cited patent for additional reasons; however, the foregoing is believed to be sufficient. Likewise, it is noted that the Assignee's failure to comment directly upon any of the positions asserted by the Examiner in the office action does not indicate agreement or acquiescence with those asserted positions. Furthermore, where minor clerical and/or typographical errors have been corrected via amendment, such amendments were not made to overcome any cited document, therefore no estoppel has been generated thereby.

012.P59016

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested. Reconsideration of the present patent application and early allowance of all the claims is respectfully requested. Authorization is hereby given, if needed, to charge any underpayments or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3703.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney, Kenneth J. Cool, at (503) 439-6500 if there remains any issue with allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE

Date: April 5, 2006

/Kenneth J. Cool - Reg. No. 40,570/

Kenneth J. Cool
Reg. No. 40,570

Customer No. 43831

Berkeley Law and Technology Group, LLC
1700 NW 167th Place, Suite 240
Beaverton, OR 97006
503.439.6500